

**REMARKS**

The present application includes claims 1-3, 5-20, 92-93, 95-96, 100-101, 104-120, 123-125, 128-134, 136-138 and 140-162. Claims 140 – 159 are withdrawn, and are cancelled herewith. Claims 5, 6 and 112 are cancelled herewith and their limitations incorporated into claim 1.

Claims 1, 7, 12, 13, 14 and 16 are amended herewith.

**Rejections**

Claims 1, 3, 5-13, 19-20, 95, 100, 104-112, 114-120, 123-134, 136-137, 140 and 142-159 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osaku et al. (U.S. patent 6,061,738) in view of "Internationalization of Domain names" and further in view of Hedin et al. (EU 0387226 A1).

Claims 2, 14, 92, 101, 113 and 141 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osaku et al. (U.S. patent 6,061,738) in view of "Internationalization of Domain names", in view of Hedin et al. (EU 0387226 A1) and further in view of Cummings.

Claims 16-18, 93, 96, 138, 161 and 162 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osaku et al. (U.S. patent 6,061,738) in view of "Internationalization of Domain names", in view of Hedin et al. (EU 0387226 A1) and further in view of Jacobson et al. (US patent 6,070,157).

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osaku et al. (U.S. patent 6,061,738) in view of "Internationalization of Domain names", in view of Hedin et al. (EU 0387226 A1) and further in view of Cummings and further in view of Jacobson et al. (US patent 6,070,157).

**Interview**

Applicants thank Examiner Blair for the Interview held at Examiner Blair's office on October 16, 2007. The present response includes, inter alia, the arguments made for patentability at that interview.

**Independent claim 1**

Independent claim 1 contains the limitation "directly displaying said page, using a browser, without any additional user intervention beyond said entering". In the interview, the

Examiner indicated that reciting a positive limitation in the claim, such as that of claim 6, would render the claim patentable.

In accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, claim 1 is currently amended to include the limitations of claim 6 and intervening claims 5 and 112.

Applicants respectfully submit that the art of record does not teach or suggest a method as currently recited in claim 1. *For example, the cited art does not teach or suggest a method that comprises both "directly displaying said page, using a browser, without any additional user intervention beyond said entering" and " wherein said page address is determined using a database of associations, said database is at least logically associated with a particular user, and said database includes information regarding a particular user, which information is entered by said user, which page is selected for display responsive to said information and wherein said database is stored at a location remote from where the information is entered for display of said page". Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited art.*

#### **Independent claim 14**

Independent claim 14 contains a limitation of providing user dependent information. In the interview, the Examiner indicated that claim 14 would be allowed if the term "user dependent information" is made more definite. Claim 14 is currently amended to contain a limitation that the user-dependent information includes at least one of geographical location of the user, the user belonging to a certain customer club, the user profile, the user age, and the user previous browsing habit".

Applicants respectfully submit that the art on record does not teach or suggest a method as currently claimed in claim 14. *For example, the cited art does not teach or suggest a method comprising both*

*"providing said information to a software not associated with said site, along with user-dependent information not entered by the user in a session in which the information is entered, wherein said user dependent information includes at least one of geographical location of the user, the user belonging to a certain customer club, the user profile, the user age, and the user browsing habits"*  
*and*

*"directly displaying said page, using a browser, without any additional user intervention beyond said entering".*

**Independent claim 16**

In line with the general tenet of the interview that the claims should be more definite, claim 16 is currently amended to state that the geographical location is of the user.

Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art on record does not teach or suggest a method as claimed in claim 16. *For example, the prior art on record does not teach or suggest a method comprising both "determining a geographical location of the user" and "directly displaying said page, using a browser, without any additional user intervention beyond said entering".*

**Dependent claims**

The dependent claims are allowable at least by the virtue of their parent claim. For brevity, applicants are not listing or arguing dependent claims which add further patentability over the art.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above remarks, applicants respectfully await allowance of the claims. In the event that the Examiner finds any further problems, which would make it impossible to issue an allowance for all the claims, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at (703) 598-7851.

Respectfully submitted,



Martin D. Moynihan  
Registration No. 40,338

Date: March 4, 2008